



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/680,463	10/07/2003	Daniel Leonard Floding	27644.22 5165		
32300	7590 03/01/2005		EXAMINER		
BRIGGS AND MORGAN P.A.			PETERSON, KENNETH E		
2200 IDS CENTER 80 SOUTH 8TH ST			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			3724		

DATE MAILED: 03/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				r				
		Application N	0.	Applicant(s)				
		10/680,463		FLODING ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit				
		Kenneth E Pet		3724				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication Reply	ion appears on the cov	er sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	ldress			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failt Any	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION OF THIS C	TION. CFR 1.136(a). In no event, he ation. ys, a reply within the statutory in the statutory in the statutory is period will apply and will expired by statute, cause the application.	owever, may a reply be tim minimum of thirty (30) day: ire SIX (6) MONTHS from in to become ABANDONE!	nely filed s will be considered timel the mailing date of this c D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1)[\inf	Responsive to communication(s) filed or	n <i>27 Januar</i> v 2005.						
	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.							
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	ion of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the applied 4a) Of the above claim(s) 3,6-9,11,14,16 Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1,2,4,5,10,12,13,15,18,20,25 a Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction	5,17,19,21-24,26 and		rawn from conside	eration. ·			
Applicat	ion Papers							
9)[The specification is objected to by the Ex	caminer.						
10)[The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)[☐ accepted or b)☐ c	bjected to by the F	Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection	• • •	-	` '				
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the The oath or declaration is objected to by				• •			
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
a)!	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for f All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority doc 2. Certified copies of the priority doc 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International See the attached detailed Office action fo	uments have been re- uments have been re- ne priority documents Bureau (PCT Rule 17	ceived. ceived in Application have been received (.2(a)).	on Noed in this National	Stage			
		•						
Attachmen	• •		_					
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9	4) [Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da	(PTO-413)				
3) 🛛 Infori	re of Draitsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-S mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO er No(s)/Mail Date <u>20jan04</u> .	(SB/08) 5)	Notice of Informal Particle Other:		D-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/680,463 Page 2

Art Unit: 3724

1. Claims 3,6-9,11,14,16,17,19,21-24,26,28-33 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected group, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in the reply filed on 27 Jan 05.

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 3. Claims 1,2,4,5,10,12,15,18,20,25 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lynch et al.'890, who shows a perforator/slitter with all of the recited limitations including slitting knife (69) and a perforating wheel (68) having dull notches as seen in figure 3.

In regards to claim 12, disk 71 is considered to be an actuator, since rotation thereof moves the slitter into a cutting position.

- 4. Claims 1,2,10 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Willhite, Jr. et al.'045, who shows a perforator/slitter with all of the recited limitations including slitting knife (54) and a perforating wheel (44).
- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1,2,4,5,10,12,13,15,18,20,25 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Willhite, Jr. et al.'045, who shows a perforator/slitter with most of the recited limitations, as set forth above.

Willhite's perforator is not drawn clearly, so it is not clear if it has dull notches between the teeth. However, Examiner takes Official Notice that such is a prevalent feature on perforating disks. An example of this is the patent to Lynch et al.'890 (68). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have employed a perforating disk having dull notches, as is known in the art and taught by Lynch, in order to not cut a continuous line, thus delivering the desired perforations.

In regards to claims 12 and 13, Willhite's slitter is selectively engageable with the work by pressing the work against the blade with elements 61 and 62. Examiner takes Official Notice that it is well known to instead employ pneumatic cylinders to move the slitting knife into engagement with the work. An example of this is the patent to Hawkin '085 (21,23). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Willhite by employing a pneumatic cylinders to move the slitting knife into engagement with the work, as is well known and taught by Hawkins, since this is an art-recognized equivalent known for the same purpose. See MPEP 2144.06.

7. Made of record but not relied on are patents to Clar and Downing showing slitters selectively engageable to slit perforated lines.

Application/Control Number: 10/680,463 Page 4

Art Unit: 3724

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ken Peterson at 571-272-4512, on Monday-Thursday, 7AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allan Shoap, can be reached at 571-272-4514. In lieu of mailing, it is encouraged that papers be faxed to 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov or call the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

kp February 22, 2005